

### **REMARKS**

Prior to entry of this paper, Claims 1-132 were pending. Claim 19, 21, 22, 25, 27, 117, 119, 120, 123 and 125 were rejected. Claims 20 and 118 were objected to. Claims 1-7, 23, 24, 26, 28-36, 38, 50-96, 98-100, 106, 107, 128-132 are withdrawn. Claims 8-18, 37, 39-49, 97, 101-105, 108-116, 121, 122, 124, 126 and 127 are allowed. In this paper, no claims are amended, canceled, or added. Claims 19, 21, 22, 25, 27, 117, 119, 120, 123 and 125 are currently pending. No new matter is added by way of this amendment. For at least the following reasons, Applicants' attorneys respectfully submit that each of the presently pending claims is in condition for allowance.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C §102**

Claims 19, 21, 22, 25, 117, 119, 120 and 123 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Alexander MacInnis et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0103489, hereinafter "MacInnis"). Applicants' attorneys respectfully traverse.

Claim 19 recites, *inter alia*:

determining whether a first display position on a display panel at which a pixel of the output image is to be displayed is within an active display region of the display panel; (emphasis added.)

MacInnis does not disclose, teach, or suggest "determining whether a first display position on a display panel at which a pixel of the output image is to be displayed is within an active display region," as recited in Claim 19 (emphasis added.) MacInnis discloses that "[g]raphics windows are preferably characterized by window descriptors. Window descriptors are data structures that describe one or more parameters of the graphics window. Window descriptors may include, for example, ... location on the screen ..." (emphasis added; ¶ 52.) Those skilled in the art will appreciate that a window is represented by a relatively large group of pixels and the position of a window, as described by a window descriptor data structure is not the same as the position of an individual pixel. A particular pixel within a window described by the window descriptor, may fall anywhere on the screen depending on the size and position of the window in which the pixel is contained. Therefore, determining the position of an output pixel is not the same as determining the position of a window represented by a relatively large group of pixels.

Furthermore, MacInnis does not disclose determining whether such pixel position “is within an active display region”, as recited in Claim 19. MacInnis discloses using a window descriptor data structure for sorting and displaying their respective graphic windows as a whole, in contrast to pixel-level processing, as recited in Claim 19 (see MacInnis, ¶¶ 0053 and 0091). MacInnis does not disclose, teach, or even remotely suggest using a window descriptor to determine whether the corresponding window is within an active display region, let alone disclosing determining whether a pixel is within an active display region. Therefore, Claim 19 is submitted to be allowable for at least the reasons presented above.

Claim 21 depends from Claim 19 and is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 19.

Claims 22, 25, 117, 120, and 123 recite substantially similar features, in relevant portions, as those discussed above with respect to Claim 19 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 19.

Claim 119 depends from Claim 117 and is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 117.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C §103

Claims 27 and 125 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robert Cherry et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,629,720, hereinafter “Cherry”). Applicants’ attorneys respectfully traverse.

Claims 27 and 125 recited substantially similar features, in relevant portions, as those discussed above with respect to Claim 19 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 19. As discussed above with respect to Claim 19, MacInnis does not disclose, teach, or even suggest “determining whether a first display position on a display panel at which a pixel of the output image is to be displayed is within an active display region,” as recited in Claim 19 (emphasis added.) Cherry fails to supply the teachings missing from MacInnis. Cherry discloses a “display mode processor which maps pixel inputs into addresses for entries in window-specific color look-up tables in accordance with a predetermined display mode.” (Abstract.) It is unclear how mapping “input data into addresses to window-specific color look-up

tables”, (see Col. 2, lines 25-27) teach or suggest determining whether a pixel position is within an active display area, as recited in Claim 27. Cherry discloses various display mode tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 as examples of how “frame buffer data 202 (FB0-FB5) are converted into the mode multiplexer output addresses for different display modes” (col. 6, lines 8-17.) Converting frame buffer data 202 into output addresses for different display modes is not the same as determining whether a pixel position is within an active display area. The active display area, as described in the present specification, is a state of the display when “not during horizontal blanking and vertical blanking periods” (specification page 26, lines 20-21.) Active status of a window, as disclosed by Cherry (see Col. 10, lines, 13-16 and 50-60) is not the same as an active display area, as recited in Claim 27. Active status of the window is used for overlaying the cursor data 206 for the global cursor on an active window. Thus “active window” is not the same as “active display area,” which signifies a non-blanking period of the display. Therefore, Claim 27 is submitted to be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claim 125 recites substantially similar features, in relevant portions, as those discussed above with respect to Claim 27 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 27.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks Examiner for allowing claims 8-18, 37, 39-49, 97, 101-105, 108-116, 121, 122, 124, 126 and 127. Applicant also thanks Examiner for allowing Claims 20 and 118 if re-written in independence form.

#### CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims 19, 21, 22, 25, 27, 117, 119, 120, 123 and 125 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants’ representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that the prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although only certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other

arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentable. Applicant reserves the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Dated: July 17, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John W. Branch

Registration No.: 41,633

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 770

Church Street Station

New York, New York 10008-0770

(206) 262-8906

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant